

The Honorable James L. Robart

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE**

MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington corporation,

Plaintiff.

V.

MOTOROLA, INC., and MOTOROLA
MOBILITY LLC, and GENERAL
INSTRUMENT CORPORATION.

Defendants

CASE NO. C10-1823-JLR

DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO FILE
DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL IN
SUPPORT OF AUGUST 7, 2013
LETTER FROM RALPH PALUMBO

**NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:
Friday, August 16, 2013**

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Western District of Washington Civil Local Rule CR 5(g)(2), Defendants Motorola, Inc. (now Motorola Solutions, Inc.), Motorola Mobility LLC, and General Instrument Corporation (collectively “Motorola”) respectfully move this Court for leave to file under seal the following:

1. August 7, 2013 Letter from Ralph Palumbo to the Court, regarding the July 31, 2013 Amended Expert Report of Todd Menenberg.
 2. Exhibit 1 to the August 7, 2013 Letter.
 3. Exhibit 2 to the August 7, 2013 Letter.

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO FILE DOCUMENTS
UNDER SEAL IN SUPPORT OF AUGUST 7, 2013 LETTER
FROM RALPH PALUMBO - 1
CASE NO. C10-1823-JLR**

SUMMIT LAW GROUP PLLC
315 FIFTH AVENUE SOUTH, SUITE 1000
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-2682
Telephone: (206) 676-7000
Fax: (206) 676-7001

1 4. Exhibit 3 to the August 7, 2013 Letter.

2 **II. CERTIFICATION**

3 In accordance with Local Civil Rule 5(g)(3)(A), the undersigned counsel certifies that on
4 August 7, 2013 Chris Wion and Shane Cramer (on behalf of Microsoft) and Phil McCune and
5 Andrea Pallios Roberts (on behalf of Motorola) met and conferred, both telephonically and via
6 email, regarding the need and extent to file under seal certain limited portions of Mr. Palumbo's
7 August 7, 2013 Letter, and supporting exhibits.

8 **III. BACKGROUND**

9 Microsoft Corporation ("Microsoft") and Motorola entered into a stipulated Protective
10 Order, which was approved by the Court on July 21, 2011. (Dkt. No. 72.) This Protective Order
11 outlines categories of material that should be maintained in confidence, along with procedures for
12 sealing confidential material when included in documents filed with the Court. Specifically,
13 paragraph 1 specifies that:

14 Confidential Business Information is information which has not been made public
15 and which concerns or relates to the trade secrets ... amount or source of any
16 income, profits, losses, or expenditures of any person, firm, partnership,
17 corporation, or other organization, the disclosure of which information is likely to
have the effect of causing substantial harm to the competitive position of the
person, firm, partnership, corporation, or other organization from which the
information was obtained....

18 *Id.* at 1-2. This information should be marked as "CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS
19 INFORMATION, SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER." *Id.* at 2. Additionally, paragraph 6
20 specifies that:

21 (1) Confidential Business Information pertaining to licensing or other
22 commercially sensitive financial information shall not be made available under
this paragraph 6 to such designated in-house counsel; the supplier shall designate
such Confidential Business Information pertaining to licensing or other
commercially sensitive financial information as "[SUPPLIER'S NAME]
CONFIDENTIAL FINANCIAL INFORMATION – OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS'
EYES ONLY – SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER" and promptly provide a
redacted version of such document that may be disseminated to the two in-house
counsel designated under this paragraph 6....

1 *Id.* at 4. Finally, Paragraph 2 of the Protective Order governs the sealing of documents, and states
 2 in relevant part that:

3 During the pre-trial phase of this action, such information, whether submitted in
 4 writing or in oral testimony, shall be disclosed only *in camera* before the Court
 5 and shall be filed only under seal, pursuant to Rule 5(g) of the Local Civil Rules
 6 of the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington.

7 *Id.* at 2.

8 Thus, the Protective Order provides that Motorola may request to seal documents by
 9 formal motion pursuant to Rule 5(g) of the Local Civil Rules of the Western District of
 10 Washington. Local Rule Rule 5(g)(3) states that:

11 (3) A motion to seal a document, even if it is a stipulated motion,
 12 must include the following:

13 (A) a certification that the party has met and conferred with all
 14 other parties in an attempt to reach agreement on the need to file
 15 the document under seal, to minimize the amount of material
 16 filed under seal, and to explore redaction and other alternatives
 17 to filing under seal; this certification must list the date, manner,
 18 and participants of the conference;

19 (B) a specific statement of the applicable legal standard and the
 20 reasons for keeping a document under seal, with evidentiary
 21 support from declarations where necessary.

22 Where parties have entered a litigation agreement or stipulated
 23 protective order (*see* LCR 26(c)(2)) governing the exchange in
 24 discovery of documents that a party deems confidential, a party
 25 wishing to file a confidential document it obtained from another
 26 party in discovery may file a motion to seal but need not satisfy
 the motion to seal or in a stipulated motion.

27 Similarly, federal law recognizes that courts should protect trade secrets or other
 28 confidential commercial information by reasonable means, permitting the filing under seal of
 29 documents containing such information. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1)(G) and (H) (stating that a
 30 court may require that (1) “a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or

1 commercial information not be revealed or be revealed only in a specified way” and (2) “the
2 parties simultaneously file specified documents or information in sealed envelopes...”).

3 Though courts recognize a general right to inspect and copy public records and documents,
4 including judicial records, the United States Supreme Court has stated that this right is limited.
5 “[T]he right to inspect and copy judicial records is not absolute. Every court has supervisory
6 power over its own records and files, and access has been denied where court files might have
7 become a vehicle for improper purposes.” *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598
8 (1978). In discussing examples of improper purposes, the Court indicated that courts are not to
9 serve as “sources of business information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” *Id.*

10 As the Ninth Circuit stated:

11 The law, however, gives district courts broad latitude to grant protective orders to
12 prevent disclosure of materials for many types of information, including, but not
13 limited to, trade secrets or other confidential research, development, or
14 commercial information. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(7). Rule 26(c) authorizes the
15 district court to issue “any order which justice requires to protect a party or
person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden.” The
Supreme Court has interpreted this language as conferring “broad discretion on
the trial court to decide when a protective order is appropriate and what degree of
protection is required.” *Seattle Times Co. v. Rhinehart*, 467 U.S. 20, 36 (1984).

16 *Phillips v. General Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1211 (9th Cir. 2002).

17 **IV. THE PROTECTIVE ORDER BOTH PERMITS AND REQUIRES MOTOROLA
18 TO FILE THIS MOTION FOR LEAVE TO SEAL**

19 In accordance with the Protective Order and the above-referenced authority, Motorola
moves to file the documents described below under seal.

21 Mr. Palumbo’s August 7, 2013 Letter contains quotes of information Microsoft designated
22 as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL FINANCIAL INFORMATION – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY.”
The un-redacted version of this document should accordingly be sealed.

24 Exhibit 1 to the August 7, 2013 Letter is excerpts from the transcript of the August 30,
25 2013 Hearing held before this Court. This transcript is not yet available publicly and contains

1 references to the legal costs incurred by Microsoft, which Microsoft has advised Motorola should
2 be kept under seal. The un-redacted version of this document should accordingly be sealed.

3 Exhibit 2 to the August 7, 2013 Letter is a document produced by Microsoft bearing
4 document control number MS-MOTO_1823_0006002291B. Microsoft designated this document
5 "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL FINANCIAL INFORMATION – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY."
6 This document should accordingly be sealed.

7 Exhibit 3 to the August 7, 2013 Letter is a document produced by Microsoft bearing
8 document control number MS-MOTO_1823_0006002291C. Microsoft designated this document
9 "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL FINANCIAL INFORMATION – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY."
10 This document should accordingly be sealed.

11 **V. CONCLUSION**

12 For the foregoing reasons, Motorola respectfully requests that this Court order that the
13 following document be filed under seal:

- 14
- 15 1. Mr. Palumbo's August 7, 2013 Letter.
 - 16 2. Exhibit 1 to the August 7, 2013 Letter.
 - 17 3. Exhibit 2 to the August 7, 2013 Letter.
 - 18 4. Exhibit 3 to the August 7, 2013 Letter

19 DATED this 7th day of August, 2013.

20 Respectfully submitted,

21 SUMMIT LAW GROUP PLLC

22 By /s/ Ralph H. Palumbo

23 By /s/ Philip S. McCune

24 Ralph H. Palumbo, WSBA #04751
Philip S. McCune, WSBA #21081
ralphp@summitlaw.com
philm@summitlaw.com

1 By /s/ Thomas V. Miller
2

3 Thomas V. Miller
4 MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC
5 600 North U.S. Highway 45
6 Libertyville, IL 60048-1286
7 (847) 523-2162

8
9 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
10 SULLIVAN, LLP

11 By /s/ Kathleen M. Sullivan
12

13 Kathleen M. Sullivan, NY #1804624
14 51 Madison Ave., 22nd Floor
15 New York, NY 10010
16 (212) 849-7000
17 *kathleensullivan@quinnmanuel.com*

18 By /s/ Brian C. Cannon
19

20 Brian C. Cannon, CA #193071
21 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
22 Redwood Shores, CA 94065
23 (650) 801-5000
24 *briancannon@quinnmanuel.com*

25 By /s/ William C. Price
26

William C. Price, CA #108542
865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 443-3000
williamprice@quinnmanuel.com

27
28 ***Attorneys for Motorola Solutions, Inc.,***
29 ***Motorola Mobility LLC and General***
30 ***Instrument Corp.***

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this day I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following:

Arthur W. Harrigan, Jr., Esq.
Christopher T. Wion, Esq.
Shane P. Cramer, Esq.
Calfo Harrigan Leyh & Eakes LLP
arthurh@calfoharrigan.com
chrisw@calfoharrigan.com
shanec@calfoharrigan.com

Richard A. Cederoth, Esq.
Brian R. Nester, Esq.
David T. Pritikin, Esq.
Douglas I. Lewis, Esq.
John W. McBride, Esq.
David Greenfield, Esq.
William H. Baumgartner, Jr., Esq.
David C. Giardina, Esq.
Carter G. Phillips, Esq.
Constantine L. Trela, Jr., Esq.
Ellen S. Robbins, Esq.
Nathaniel C. Love, Esq.
Sidley Austin LLP
rcederoth@sidley.com
bnester@sidley.com
dpritikin@sidley.com
dilewis@sidley.com
jwmcbride@sidley.com
david.greenfield@sidley.com
wbaumgartner@sidley.com
dgiardina@sidley.com
cphillips@sidley.com
ctrela@sidley.com
erobbins@sidley.com
nlove@sidley.com

T. Andrew Culbert, Esq.
David E. Killough, Esq.
Microsoft Corp.
andycu@microsoft.com
davkill@microsoft.com

DATED this 7th day of August, 2013.

/s/ Marcia A. Ripley

Marcia A. Ripley

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO FILE DOCUMENTS
UNDER SEAL IN SUPPORT OF AUGUST 7, 2013 LETTER
FROM RALPH PALUMBO - 7
CASE NO. C10-1823-JLR**

SUMMIT LAW GROUP PLLC
315 FIFTH AVENUE SOUTH, SUITE 1000
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-2682
Telephone: (206) 676-7000
Fax: (206) 676-7001